

ENGINEERING OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AUGUST 7, 1997, 9:00 A.M. EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM

Present: C. T. Maki G. D. Taylor J. D. Culp

C. Roberts W. Stebbins (P. Miller) R. S. Cadena

J. J. Kanillopoolos E. Savas D. L. Smiley (J. W. Reincke)

N. Stoner (T. Fort) E. D. Winkler G. Etelamaki

Guest: B. W. Ness C. Bleech W. Mathies

S. Bower

OLD BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Minutes of the June 5, 1997, Meeting - C. T. Maki

Minutes of the June 5, 1997, meeting were approved as written.

2. Corridor Basis Construction (CBC) - B. W. Ness

B. W. Ness, CBC Chairperson, summarized the committee's efforts since being formed in April 1997. The committee has met twice and has drafted its work objectives, products, and issues requiring resolution. The overall goal is to minimize disruption to corridor users during construction activities. Following are the corridor needs/objectives:

- A. A corridor requires a mix of repair strategies and fix lives to distribute future rehabilitation work over a longer term.
- B. All required rehabilitation work should be performed at the same time to keep user delay costs to a minimum over the project's service life.
- C. Identify alternate travel routes with assurance of no user delay during the corridor improvement project(s).

Expected products:

- A. Develop a method and strategy to measure outcomes for high level systems (Project Development Engineers will assist in this effort).
- B. Develop a list of suitable work items for specific types of highway corridors.
- C. Identify all high impact corridors in the state.

Pending issues:

- A. Multiple funding sources will be involved in a corridor (e.g. bridge, preservation, safety, etc.).
- B. A wide variety of interest must reach consensus, e.g. safety, congestion, road, bridge, safety, etc.
- C. Statewide funding distributions the potential exists that northern areas will have less corridor needs and thus not get there current share of the funds.

ACTION: The Corridor Construction Committee will provide updates as progress continues. (A committee membership list is attached.)

3. Bituminous Advisory Committee (BAC) Future - E. D. Winkler

A revised guidance document for the BAC was presented, along with a new operational schematic for the MAPA/MDOT joint industry committee structure. Some recommendations to change the guidance document were made and approved.

ACTION: The guidance document and committee operational plan are approved, with the modifications discussed. A revised final draft version will be distributed with the minutes and will be given final approval at the next meeting when the minutes are reviewed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Metric Presentation - N. Stoner

In appreciation of the department adopting metric standards, an award was presented to the department, signed by Jane Garvey, Acting FHWA Administrator. Tom Maki accepted on behalf of the department.

2. Research Report RC-1354, *Highway Construction and Maintenance Work Zone Safety* - D. L. Smiley

The report was tabled until the department's Construction Zone Advisory Committee can complete their review and comment on the proposed action items.

3. Pavement Type Selection (C.S. 47014, J.N. 34120, US-23, Fausett Road to North County Line, District 8) - S. Bower

Three construction alternatives were presented.

Decision - Approve alternate 2, as follows:

	90 mm (5.5 in 30 mm (1 in.= 228.6 mm (9 100 mm (4 in	in.±) Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement Overlay (4.0 m Joint Spacing) n.±)
4.	Pavement Ty District 7) - S	ype Selection (C.S. 11112, J.N. 38613 and 38615, US-31 North to I-94, S. Bower
	Three constru	action alternatives were presented.
	Decision - Approve alternate 2, as follows:	
	140 mm (5½ 100 mm (4 in 300 mm (12 i	Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement (4 m - 14 ft Joint) in.±) Bituminous Shoulders±) Open Graded Drainage Course-Modified Geotextile Separator n.±) Sand Subbase±) Open Graded Underdrains
5.	Pavement Type Selection (C.S. 03111, J.N. 37997, US-131 From R02 to South of M-222, District 7) - S. Bower	
	Two construction alternatives were presented.	
	Decision - Approve alternate 2, as follows:	
	180 mm (7 in.±)	
	NOTE:	Discussion occurred regarding calculation of user delay costs and inclusion as part of the project's life cycle cost. These projects (New Business Items 3, 4, and 5) are the first to include user delay costs as part of the project's

total life cycle cost, as directed by the Transportation Commission. The new state law requires the project with the lowest life cycle cost be selected.

(Signed Copy on File at C&T/Secondary) James D. Culp, Secretary **Engineering Operations Committee**

JDC:DLS:kat

Attachments

cc: **EOC Members**

District Engineers

J. R. DeSana R. J. Risser, Jr. (MCPA) T. Adams (MCA) B. Richter R. A. Welke A. C. Milo (MRBA) J. Ruszkowski R. D. Till J. Becsey (MAPA) D. L. Smiley C. Libiran S. Bower G. L. Mitchell L. E. DeFrain G. J. Bukoski C. W. Whiteside M. Newman (MAA) J. Steele (FHWA) M. Frierson K. Rothwell

R. J. Lippert, Jr.